



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/22/3295923

70 Saxon Way Bradley Stoke Bristol BS32 9AR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Manning against the decision of South Gloucestershire District Council.
 - The application Ref: P21/02619/F dated 9 April 2021 was refused by notice dated 6 January 202.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension creating incidental partial annex to main dwelling for parents.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal:
 - (i) upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling,
 - (ii) upon living conditions for neighbouring users.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 70 Saxon Way (No.70) is a detached house with a gabled frontage located in an area of late-twentieth-century, mostly detached, housing. The housing layout, plainly designed with the intention of achieving a good density of development and efficient land use whilst retaining reasonable privacy and open outlook, results in a variety of plot configurations and aspect.
4. Policy PSP1 together with Policy PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies Sites and Places Plan 2017 (Local Plan) supports residential extensions but seek the retention of local distinctiveness and that proposals should demonstrate an appreciation of architectural form. The South Gloucestershire Householder Design Guide 2021 (Design Guide) requires side extensions to be subservient in character and scale.
5. The proposal would add a two-storey extension to the side of No.70 and a single storey lobby to the front of that extension. The two-storey element of the extension would appear as a slightly smaller and set back version of No.70's main frontal gable tightly abutting the flank wall of the host dwelling. So, whilst incorporating the visual characteristics of the host dwelling and seemingly

scaled down (although the internal width of the addition is actually slightly greater than that of the gable it purports to be subservient to), the result would present as an uncomfortably juxtaposed competing element rather than as a secondary or subservient built form.

6. The proposal would fail to accord with the principles set out in the Local Plan policies identified nor would it accord with the guidance set out in the householder design guide as to the relationship of additional built form with the primary building. However, I attach no more than moderate weight to these conflicts as the harm arises from a lack of visual consistency in a suburban area with a range of architectural approaches and configurations of built form.

Neighbouring Users

7. No.70 faces south-east, situated within a relatively large plot to the south side of two dwellings, No. 48 and No. 50 Saxon Way which are accessed from another shared private drive. The appellant, in justification of his proposal, points to No.50 as an example of a prominent side extension which the Council have approved. However, the extension to No.50 is set forward of the front elevation of the appeal property and any enclosing effect relates to the forecourt of No.70 and its garage, having no impact on its rear amenity space. In any event No. 70 has a relatively open aspect to the west and south, whereas No.50 lies to the north of the appeal site, thereby having limited impact on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
8. No.48 Saxon Way is located within a smaller plot which abuts the appeal site on its northern side such that the proposed extension would extend to within 800mm of the shared boundary at a point which lies due south of the affected property, prominently within the outlook from its garden room. The garden area of No.48 is relatively small, so although No.48 would not lose its south-westerly aspect, my observations indicate that the result of the proposal, its proximity and bulk at two-storeys in height (notwithstanding the adjustments pointed to) would both reduce access to sunlight from the south-east and, by its proximity to the boundary, be overbearing of the garden area to No.48. The proposal would fail to meet the requirements of PSP8 and PSP38 of the Local Plan which seek to protect amenity and living conditions of neighbouring users.

Conclusion and Balance.

9. Whilst I attach no more than moderate weight to the first main issue, I give significant weight to the impact on neighbouring users directs that what is proposed cannot benefit from the provision set out in Policies PSP8 and PSP38 of the Local Plan that support residential extensions. The conflict is not outweighed by other considerations as it is plainly possible to devise other, more appropriate, ways to provide additional accommodation.
10. Consequently, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account I conclude the proposal conflicts with the Development Plan as a whole such that the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR